DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 543 HE 021 476

AUTHOR Kuh, George D.; Whitt, Elizabeth J.
TITLE Using the Cultural Lens To Understand Faculty Behavior.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Higher Education; *Organizational Climate; Quality of Working Life; *Socialization; *Subcultures; Teacher Morale; Values; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

The way that the concept of culture has been used in the higher education literature to account for certain aspects of faculty life is examined. Culture is defined as the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individual faculty and groups and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus. Attention is also directed to uses of the concept of subculture to describe faculty groups. Research on faculty subcultures has been influenced by two dominant views: (1) academics comprise a single homogenous profession, characterized more by similarities than differences; and (2) the academic profession is a complex of subprofessions or many professions. Enclaves within subcultures, including disciplinary subspecialties, are considered, along with the question of whether women faculty, ethnic and racial minority faculty, and part-time faculty comprise subcultures. Finally, clans and occupational communities are discussed. It is concluded that the role of institutional and disciplinary culture in the socialization processes of faculty is essentially undocumented. Fifteen pages of references are provided. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295543

Using The Cultural Lens to Understand Faculty Behavior

George D. Kuh and Elizabeth J. Whitt

School of Education
Indiana University-Bloomington
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 335-9076

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GEORGE D KUH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1988

HE021 476

Using The Cultural Lens To Understand Faculty Behavior

Colleges and universities are not only, or even primarily, educational institutions. They are social communities as well (Hochbaum, 1968; Jacob, 1957; Sanford, 1962). A stroll across a college campus suggests that faculty have a way of life all their own, a culture, if you will. Role expectations for MIT faculty are different from those of, say, the faculty at St. Olaf, Bryn Mawr, and Idaho State. But other institutional features--academic ceremonies, a distinctive language--also distinguish how faculty at these institutions think and act. In order to understand **why** faculty think and behave as they do, "we must first be able to both appreciate and describe their culture" (Van Maanen, 1979, p. 522).

The culture concept is not new to higher education scholars interested in faculty behavior. For example, observed similarities in the behavior of faculty members led Clark (1963) to categorize faculty according to the extent of their identification with the cultures of their institution and/or their discipline. Becher (1984) also used a cultural lens to identify assumptions that differentiated patterns of knowledge production and utilization across academic disciplines.

In this paper, we will examine how the concept of culture has been used to describe and understand faculty. We originally intended to analyze studies of how academic cultures form and the impact of external forces on shared beliefs and values of faculty subcultures. We also hoped to find examples of institution- and subculture-specific symbols,

stories, language, stories, values, norms, and other artifactual elements (Barley, 1983; Crane, 1972; Schein, 1985) that would provide some evocative illustrative material in this regard. Although the theoretical and conceptual literature, particularly sociological interpretations of academic culture, is fairly rich, research which identifies cultural elements of specific faculty subgroups is sparse.[1] As a result, we have revised our goals for the paper.

First, we will review the concept of culture and briefly discuss how the cultural perspective has been used in the higher education literature to account for certain aspects of faculty life. Then we will explore various uses of the concept of subculture to describe faculty groups (e.g., faculty as a single subculture and as a federation of discipline-based subcultures). We will also examine enclaves within subcultures, including disciplinary subspecialties, and consider whether women faculty, ethnic and racial minority faculty, and part-time faculty comprise subcultures. The paper concludes with a discussion of two additional views compatible with the cultural perspective, clans and occupational communities. These views are potentially fruitful frameworks for examining faculty subgroups.

An Overview of The Culture Concept

Higher education scholars have used the concept of culture to identify beliefs, shared meanings, guiding premises and assumptions, norms, rituals, and customs and practices (Morgan, 1986) to better understand and appreciate the meaning faculty give to events and actions within and across institutional settings (Geertz, 1973). Use of the

cultural perspective permits coherent interpretations of events that may seem, at first glance, to be atomistic (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Keller, 1986; Sanford, 1962).

Seemingly routine processes, such as course scheduling, monthly faculty meetings, and annual performance reviews, when considered one at a time and independent of their cultural implications, may seem trivial or void of larger significance (Clark, 1972; Pondy & Mitroff, 1979; Smircich, 1983). For example, to the casual observer, annual events such as the departmental orientation meeting for new faculty and commencement weekend may simply mark beginnings and endings. However, such ceremonies also can serve as important, unifying rituals through which successive generations of faculty are socialized and bonded to one another, to the institution, and to the community of scholars. When individual acts and events are thought of as part of larger patterns of behavior and meaning, routine, mundane events and actions are perceived to have a significant, cumulative impact on institutional life (Kuh & Whitt, forthcoming).

Using a cultural perspective to interpret faculty behavior is not without problems. The term "culture" has been used in a cavalier fashion to address almost any behavior, activity, or process in an IHE (Dill, 1982). As a consequence, the level of precision typically expected of social science research has, in some cases, been compromised.

Interpretations of the most effective use of knowledge about culture also vary. Much of the business literature suggests that, once understood, "culture" can be intentionally manipulated by crafty

administrators (e.g., Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kilmann, Saxton & Serpa, 1986; Peters & Waterman; 1982). Other researchers believe that culture is deeply embedded in the psyche of a community or an organization and, so, can only be understood and described, not systematically altered (Kuh, Whitt & Shedd, 1987; Morgan, 1986; Ouchi, 1983).

Most scholars agree that culture is a multidimensional concept. For example, Clark (1984) asserted that higher education includes four discrete but interdependent cultures which influence a faculty member's beliefs and behavior: (a) the culture of the discipline, (b) the culture of the academic profession, (c) the culture of the institution, and (d) the culture of the national system of higher education. The suggestion that Clark's (1984) four cultures simultaneously interact with other subcultures to which faculty belong is illustrative of the degree of complexity with which scholars must contend when studying the relationship of culture to faculty behavior.

Culture is defined and bound by the context in which it occurs (Hall, 1976; Kuh & Whitt, forthcoming). Thus, although IHEs may share similar norms, values, symbols, and rituals, the culture of each institution is unique. As a consequence, faculty behavior can be interpreted only within the cultural milieu of a specific college, department, or discipline. To attempt to divorce interpretations of behavior "from what happens--at this time or in that place, what specific people say, what they do, what is done to them, from the whole vast business of the world--is to divorce it from its applications and render it vacant"

(Geertz, 1973, p. 18). Thus, descriptions and interpretations of events and actions from one IHE are not generalizable to other institutions.

Toward a Definition of Culture

Almost as many definitions of culture exist as there are scholars studying the phenomenon (Peterson, Cameron, Mets, Jones & Ettington, 1986). Multiple definitions cannot be avoided because culture has been studied by scholars from various disciplines. Anthropologists, sociologists, social psychologists, and communications theorists emphasize different aspects of culture and use different terms to communicate their ideas (Allaire & Firsirotu, 1984). In some definitions, shared values and beliefs are emphasized (e.g., Keesing, 1974; Sapienza, 1985; Schein, 1984); in others, the regulatory function of culture as lodged in accepted rules, norms and practices is underscored (Arnold & Capella, 1985; Bates, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1983).

According to Schein (1985), most definitions of culture convey one or more of the following: (a) observed behavioral regularities (Goffman, 1959, 1967; Van Maanen, 1979) such as the hours faculty spend in the office; (b) norms (Homans, 1950) or specific guides to conduct, some of which are more salient than others (i.e., mores) (Broom & Selznick, 1973); (c) dominant values espoused by the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982) such as the importance of inquiry in research-oriented universities and the commitment to undergraduate teaching in liberal arts colleges; (d) the philosophy that guides an organization's attitudes and actions toward employees or clients (Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981); (e) rules for getting along in the organization (Schein, 1968; Van

Maanen, 1979); and (f) the organizational climate and the manner in which members of the culture interact with those outside the culture (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).

Schein (1985) cautioned against overemphasizing behavioral regularities as manifestations of culture. Who talks with whom may be more a function of environmental contingencies, such as physical proximity, than a behavioral manifestation of deeper assumptions and beliefs which are at the "core" of culture. For example, inferring cultural groupings based on the location of faculty offices may or may not be appropriate. Faculty with adjoining offices may have cultural bonds or the arrangement may merely reflect a confluence of factors such as random space assignment following physical plant renovation or historical accident.

At the same time, faculty offices are usually arranged by discipline, a factor which reinforces what is considered important to study, how knowledge is created and disseminated, and how meaning is made of information--all aspects of disciplinary culture (Becher, 1984; Mitroff & Kilmann, 1978). Physical proximity may also contribute to the evolution of shared understandings and work norms (Newcomb, 1962; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984).

For the purposes of this paper, culture is defined as the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs and assumptions which guide the behavior of individual faculty and groups and provide a frame a reference within which to interpret the

meaning of events and actions on and off the campus (Kuh & Whitt, forthcoming).

The Formation of Subcultures

According to Schein (1985), culture exists in "any size of social unit that has had the opportunity to learn and stabilize its view of itself and the environment around it" (p. 8). If a group of people has shared a significant number of important experiences in responding to problems imposed by the external environment or by internal conflicts, such common experiences will probably encourage the group to develop a similar view of the institution and their place in it. Also, the value system of the group may differ from that of the host culture, providing further bonding for the group. The shared view of the group:

> has worked for long enough to have come to be taken for granted and to have dropped out of awareness. Culture in this sense is a learned product of group experience and is, therefore, to be found only where there is to be a definable group with a significant history (Schein, 1985, p. 7).

The term subculture has been applied to a wide variety of groups (Bolton & Kammeyer, 1972; Clark, 1980, 1984; Clark & Trow, 1966; Katchadourian and Boli, 1985; Leemon, 1972; Yinger, 1960). In an attempt to curb indiscriminate use of the term, Bolton and Kammeyer (1972) synthesized common sociological interpretations (e.g., Bell, 1961; Broom & Selznick, 1963; Young & Mack, 1959) and developed a more precise definition of subculture:

> A normative-value system held by some group or persons who are in persisting interaction, who transmit the norms and values to newcomers by some communicated process and who exercise some sort of social control to ensure conformity to the norms. Furthermore, the normative value system of such a group must differ from the normative value system of the larger, the parent or the dominant society (pp. 381-382).

Thus, a subculture is more than a collection of people with similar attitudes or behaviors. Members of a subculture interact persistently with one another over a period of time; they are attracted to one another; they are aware of their common orientation (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Newcomb, Koenig, Flacks & Warrick, 1967); and the possibility of group sanctions influences their behavior. While certain norms and attitudes may be at variance from the host or dominant institutional culture, members of a subculture often hold some values of the dominant culture (Broom & Selznick, 1973).

Van Maanen and Barley (1985) defined institutional subcultures as subgroups of an institution's members who interact regularly with one another, perceive themselves as a distinct group within the institution, share a commonly-defined set of problems, and act on the basis of collective understandings unique to their group. The Van Maanen and Barley (1985) definition will be used in the discussion of faculty subcultures in this paper.

Multiple Subcultures

Numerous faculty subcultures may exist within an IHE (Tierney, 1988). These subcultures form on the basis of discipline, orientation to the institution, perceptions of the faculty role, and so on. Thus, at a major research university, physics faculty may see their primary role as research and attach little value to what education faculty may regard as professional service. On the other hand, business and education faculty at the same institution may place a higher value on service. This is not to say that professional school faculty view their responsibilities in the same way. The business faculty may define "service" as consulting with major corporations (and earn one or more times their academic year salary from consulting) while education faculty may view their work with public schools as a professional obligation or courtesy.

Van Maanen and Barley (1985) posited six "social processes that appear to sire organizational subcultures" (p. 38): (a) segmentation, (b) importation, (c) technological innovation, (d) ideological differentiation, (e) contracultural movements, and (f) career filters. While all of these are potentially rich concepts for illuminating how academic cultures change over time, two--importation and technological innovation--are particularly instructive for discovering how faculty subcultures may be shaped by newcomers. **Importation** suggests that changes may occur in behavioral routines and values as a result of new members joining the unit, usually through recruitment, reassignment or mergers (e.g., administrative reorganization). **Technological innovation** forces

the institution to add faculty or professional support staff who have expertise not present within the current faculty. "Whereas certain types of technological change...may lead to the demise of [some] subcultures, other technical advances may actually empower old subcultures or create new ones" (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985, p. 43).

The spread of electronic technology throughout some areas of higher education has forced some units to use recruitment to add computer specialists. This changes the fundamental nature of an academic department as fewer faculty with core disciplinary interests are available to guide student research or teach the required substantive major courses.

The culture of the employing institution is maintained and perpetuated by teaching newcomers to view their workplace and social setting as do culture bearers (e.g., senior faculty) (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). However, according to Van Maanen (1984), "people carry culture with them" (p. 217). That is, the frame of reference developed and used in other settings affects a faculty member's understanding of, and response to, tasks, perceived performance demands, and social requirements of the new institution. Thus, newcomers shape the dominant subculture culture to some degree.

Martin and Siehl (1983) suggested that at least three types of subcultures exist within a dominant culture: (a) enhancing; (b) orthogonal; and (c) countercultural. An enhancing subculture adheres to core values of the institution more fervently than do the rest of the members of the college. Clark (1972) reported that senior faculty are most likely to use the organizational saga to interpret current circumstances.

On one campus, the professors of distinguished rank meet regularly and serve as informal advisers to the president; such a group would be an enhancing subculture if their advice and actions served to perpetuate core institutional values and discouraged initiatives which would change the mission of the institution.

Faculty using particle accelerators to conduct high energy physics research may comprise an orthogonal subculture if they "simultaneously accept the core values of the [institution] and a separate, unconflicting set of values particular to themselves" (Martin & Siehl, 1983, p. 53). It is worth noting that challenges may be made to some aspects of the dominant culture in groups (e.g., the faculty senate) which are either enhancing or orthogonal enclaves.

A subculture is a counterculture when it poses a direct threat to the values of the institution. Countercultures are likely to exist in IHEs because countercultures flourish in open, risk-free environments such as that typically found in a college or university. For example, some faculty groups (Deal & Kennedy, 1982) may manifest values antithetical to the aims of the host IHE by spending two or more days a week consulting for private gain or on business unrelated to their academic appointment.

Whether the existence of countercultures becomes debilitating to the institution depends on many factors. The press toward behaving in culturally accepted ways, an outcome of a potent subculture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Gregory, 1983), may constrain innovation or attempts to do things differently. Norms and values of dominant subcultures hinder

efforts of newcomers or members of underrepresented gender or racial groups to understand and appreciate nuances of cultural behavior. At worst, culture can be an alienating, ethnocentric force which goads members of a group, sometimes out of fear and sometimes out of ignorance, to mutually reinforce their own beliefs while rejecting those of other groups (Gregory, 1983).

It is possible for subcultures to exist within subcultures. Schisms within disciplines sometimes form when members cluster themselves on the basis of different views toward the discipline. For example, legal realists, sometimes called "Crits", have argued against the classical view of law as rational and neutral, asserting instead, that it is neither; rather the law is indeterminate, political, and susceptible to the biases of judges, juries, and lawyers. The position adopted by Crits has alienated them from their law school colleagues who hold to the classical view of law (Coughlin, 1985).

On a college campus, the antagonism between subgroups may sometimes become so intense that members of the two camps stop talking and become, for all practical purposes, two subcultures "delimited mainly by their scorn for one another" (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984, p. 44). Thus, certain characteristics of cultural groupings are potentially divisive. If routine patterns of behavior within one such group are considered normal, different activities performed by another subgroup may be judged abnormal (Morgan, 1986, p. 120). Such ethnocentric behavior may be a form of cultural nearsightedness (Broom & Selznick, 1973) or socialized

differences which increase the possibility that misunderstandings and conflicts will occur (Gregory, 1983).

Subcultures may also form within disciplines on the basis of narrowing foci of interest and inquiry (Becker, 1984). For example, the discipline of biology encompasses numerous subspecialties, the members/devotees of which serve as a primary reference group, resource, and social system for one another. These subcultures may extend beyond the boundaries of institutions and comprise "invisible colleges" of colleagues (Becher, 1987; Crane, 1972).

Socialization Processes

"A discipline is the first mark of identity a professor receives" (Ruscio, 1987, p. 332). Identification with a particular discipline is developed by means of socialization, the "mechanism through which the existing consensus structure and communication practices are transferred to new generations of participants" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 254). Socialization is cultural learning, the acquisition of values, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and expectations appropriate to a particular culture (Bess, 1978; Bragg, 1973; Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Socialization processes also give direction to performance and engender commitment to the discipline (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Whether socialization processes increase congruence between individual faculty and institutional goals is open to question (Schein, 1985).

The nature of socialization processes varies across and within institutional types and discipline groups (Van Maanen, 1976). Faculty in the humanities are socialized into "a structure of values, attitudes,

and ways of thinking and feeling" (Clark & Corcoran, 1986, p. 30) quite different from the structure to which physicists and chemists are socialized. Career path patterns of faculty in "pure" (e.g., biology, history) disciplines and "applied" (e.g., engineering, education) fields are different. Faculty in the former group learn how to behave by working side by side with senior professors in the laboratory as postdoctoral research associates. Faculty in the latter group are more likely to learn about the academic profession "on the job," during the first years of a professorial appointment after postdoctoral experience as a practicing professional in private industry, government, medicine, law, or education (Becher, 1984).

However, some typical steps in the socialization process have been identified: (a) identification of role models, (b) observation of role model behavior, (c) imitation of role model behavior, (d) evaluation by others of the "imitation," (e) modification of behavior in response to the evaluation, and (f) incorporation of values and behaviors of the role model into the newcomer's self-image (Bess, 1978). The outcomes of socialization processes are largely dependent on an institution's ability to select and use methods which communicate to participants the behaviors which are valued and rewarded (Van Maanen, 1976).

Anticipatory socialization, which typically takes place during doctoral studies (Bess, 1982; Corcoran & Clark, 1964; Freedman, 1979), is the development of a positive orientation toward discipline-based and institutional norms, including broad social prescriptions and specific behavioral guidelines which are prevalent in the group to which the

prospective faculty member aspires (Merton, 1963). Thus, prior experiences and self-images must be modified to fit the demands of new roles and new group memberships. Acceptance by the group is facilitated by the newcomer adopting the values, skills, and attitudes expected by peers (Merton, 1963).

In the words of a graduate student preparing to become a faculty member:

> [In] terms of research, academics has a creative tinge to it that allows people to adopt the artist's mode of existence. You know, we can be weird, as long as we're good, we can be weird. I don't think that happens in other parts of society. academics you don't have to strive for that kind of power or wealth or fame in order to be able to do your thing quietly... (Katz & Hartnett, 1976, p. 138)

The novice must also become aware of, and internalize, the content and parameters of the discipline, including its language, its intellectual traditions and style, its folklore, and its patterns of relationships (Becher, 1987). The following statement was made by a graduate student -- and future faculty member -- in biochemistry:

> [I] think of people as biological organisms... Studying neural chemistry has made me realize that life is flowing and beautiful and dancing on all levels. It contains all the energy--destructive, creative, and so on--on all levels, and

> so in a way you know, it's an affirmation of life and a teacher of a way of life. (Katz & Hartnett, 1976, p. 135)

Once an individual becomes a faculty member, information necessary for successful participation in the life of the institution and for making meaning of new roles, tasks and experiences is typically obtained from culture bearers such as senior, tenured faculty (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Van Maanen, 1978). Over time, newcomers begin to integrate their own needs and goals with the institution's needs and goals in a manner compatible with norms, values, and roles they perceive to be appropriate and desirable (Bess, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976). In these settings, a faculty member absorbs "the doctrines of the specialty which help to give a sense of place and to define a way of life" (Clark, 1980, p. 4) and comes to understand the "symbolic meaning of the activities in which a `professor' [at this institution] engages" (Bess, 1978, p. 293).

The Literature on Faculty Subcultures

Research on faculty subcultures has been influenced by two dominant views (Metzger, 1987). In one view, academics comprise a "single homogenous profession" (Becher, 1987), characterized more by similarities than differences. The other view describes the academic profession as a complex of subprofessions (Bess, 1982) or many professions (Ruscio, 1987). Thus, from the latter point of view, "the academic profession [per se] does not exist" (Light, 1974, p. 12).

The Academic Profession as a Subculture

Clark (1980) described academic systems in IHEs as "ideologically loaded" (p. 1), fraught with "high emotional bonding that, in part,

comes from robust ideologies" (p. 2); "[T]hey work with the ideas of their particular discipline, they are self-defined critics of society, and they are likely to have a strong opinion about the proper purpose and shape of their own campuses" (Clark, 1970, p. 253). These ideologies of the academic system provide a common characterization of faculty as people of ideas, sharing values of altruism, truth, and the life of the mind.

The academic profession values academic freedom, the community of scholars, truth and accepted wisdom, collegial governance, individual autonomy, and service to society through knowledge production, preservation of important elements of society, and education of the young (Clark, 1980; Morrill & Spees, 1982; Ruscio, 1987). The belief that there is a single academic profession and one academic culture is based on the assumption that all college and university faculty members share a common view of the world and scholarship. The shared world view of faculty reflects and is reflected in assumptions held by faculty about the nature and purposes of higher education and IHEs, and the role of faculty within them (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Freedman, 1979; Gusfield & Riesman, 1968; Ruscio, 1987).

The culture of the academic profession also provides a sense of collective identity for all faculty, regardless of disciplinary affiliation. Professors of biology, sociology, and classics alike assume the identity of the "academic man" (Clark, 1984, p. 91). Components of this common identity include three basic values shared by faculty members across academic specialties and institutional types, deviations from

which are "bitterly resisted" (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 54). The first basic value is the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge as the purpose of higher education. The primary responsibility of faculty members, then, is "to be a learned person and to convey this learning through discussion, teaching, and publication" (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 53).

The second basic value shared by faculty is autonomy in the conduct of academic work (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Faculty members believe that freedom is necessary in order to advance learning, and, so, have developed structures that reinforce autonomy, peer review, tenure, and relatively independent IHEs. The third shared value is collegiality (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Collegiality is demonstrated in a community of scholars which provides mutual support and opportunities for social interaction and in faculty governance.

Disciplinary Subcultures

The academic discipline is "the primary culture for academic workers" (Clark, 1980, p. 6), the primary source of faculty identity and expertise with, typically, stronger bonds than those developed with the institution of employment. Some observers have asserted that the differences between disciplines are greater than the similarities (Becher, 1987). In this sense, the commonalities--the shared picture of what a faculty member is and does--may obscure the underlying differences and their sources. However, "[It] is one thing to assert that the academic profession is better understood in its diversity than in its unity; it is another and more difficult task to identify the key distinctions" (Becher, 1987, p. 274).

Bowen and Schuster (1986) concluded that: "significant differences among faculty members are present on each campus and are more closely related to discipline than to type of institution (p. 52). Variations in the cultures of disciplines tend to reflect variations in intellectual tasks among the disciplines (Becher, 1984, 1987). As academic subject matter becomes increasingly narrow in focus, requiring more specialized training (Blau, 1973; Clark, 1984; Morrill & Spees, 1982), the culture of the discipline exerts more influence over a faculty member's behavior than the culture of the institution. Elements of the disciplinary culture include assumptions about what is to be known and how, assumptions about the tasks to be performed and standards for effective performance, publication patterns, patterns of professional interaction, and social and political status (Becher, 1984, 1987; Clark, 1984).

For example, the nature of knowledge within the pure sciences is cumulative and concerned with simplification and universals, resulting in explanation or discovery. In turn, elements of disciplinary culture in the pure sciences include competition, teamwork, rapid publication rates, and effective political organization (Becher, 1987). Physics, for example, is characterized by strong consensus about problems to be addressed and how to address them; findings usually build on one another in a linear fashion (Becher, 1987). In addition, "because a number of high cost areas are involved, it is in the collective interest that physicists speak with one voice about their needs...to ensure that they are given adequate resources" (Becher, 1987, p. 288). Thus, the disciplinary culture of physics is typically tightly coupled around

political and economic goals as well as assumptions about knowledge and research.

Membership in a discipline is affirmed by interaction with local and national colleagues (Clark, 1980). These "invisible colleges" (Becher, 1987, p. 286) of colleagues nurture interaction and cooperation among members and reaffirm the values of the discipline with regard to appropriate research problems and methods, appropriate interactions among colleagues, and desirable publication patterns. Professional associations also provide a powerful sense of disciplinary identity by reinforcing networks of collegial support and disciplinary values by means of admissions requirements, mission statements, association publications and conferences, and awards (Clark, 1980; Hunter & Kuh, 1987).

A number of classification systems have been developed for the study of academic disciplines. These systems have various classification criteria, including epistemology (Becher, 1987; Snow, 1959), paradigm development (Lodahl & Gordon, 1972), learning styles (Kolb, 1981), personality archetypes (Mitroff & Kilmann, 1982), and status of knowledge (Parsons & Platt, 1973).

One of the best-known typologies of disciplinary culture was developed by Clark (1963, 1980) who expanded the local-cosmopolitan continuum developed by Gouldner (1957) to provide a more detailed description of higher education faculty. Clark (1963, 1980) identified three dimensions of orientations of faculty: (a) local-cosmopolitan, based on orientation to the institution and orientation to the discipline, (b) pure-applied, based on orientation to use of knowledge, and

(c) humanistic-scientific, based on commitment to personal interpretation or public verification of knowledge. The interactions of these dimensions result in four groupings of faculty members: (a) the teacher (high identification with institution, high commitment to pure study), (b) the scholar-researcher (low institutional identification, high commitment to pure study), (c) the demonstrator (high institutional identification, low commitment to pure study), and (d) the consultant (low institutional identification, low commitment to pure study) (Clark, 1963).

Biglan (1973) created a three-dimensional model of academic disciplines. Biglan's dimensions were: (a) hard-soft, based on presence or absence of consensus on a body of theory, (b) pure-applied, based on presence or absence of concern for applications to practical problems, and (c) life-nonlife, based on the presence or absence of a research focus on living systems. Research on the Biglan model has tended to confirm that faculty members differing along these three dimensions also differ in their professional goals, tasks, and satisfaction (Creswell & Bean, 1981).

Becher's (1987) classification of disciplines is based on the nature of knowledge within the discipline. Becher (1987) identified four disciplinary groupings. The first of these was "hard pure" or pure sciences, characterized by cumulative and atomistic knowledge and concern for universals, simplification, and discovery. The second grouping was "soft-pure" or humanities and social sciences. This group is concerned with particulars, understanding, and holistic and reiterative knowledge. The "hard-applied" or technologies group (e.g., mechanical engineering)

emphasizes products and techniques and knowledge which is pragmatic and purposive. Finally, the "soft-applied" or applied social sciences group (e.g., education) is concerned with the enhancement of professional practice and knowledge that is utilitarian.

Whether these typologies qualify as subcultures is questionable. Certainly the typologies are influenced more by sociological than anthropological views of culture. The Van Maanen and Barley (1985) criteria for a subculture employed in this paper include regular interaction, group self-consciousness, shared problems, and action based on unique collective understandings. These criteria suggest that the classifications presented by Clark (1963), Biglan (1973), Becher (1987) and others do not describe subcultures, but, rather, role orientations, paradigms, or ideal types (Bolton & Kammeyer, 1972). To the extent, however, that similar role orientations create opportunities for interaction, they may provide a basis for the development of disciplinary subcultures among faculty.

> Differential interaction among an organization's membership may reflect physical proximity, the sharing of common tasks or status...or even accidents of history... [To] the degree that some members interact more frequently with others who share similar problems, this is where the seeds of organizational subcultures are sown. (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985, p. 37)

Thus, faculty members in history, who share a strong identification with their discipline and common assumptions about the nature of

knowledge may be more likely to interact with one another and, as a result, create conditions for the development of a subculture. History faculty members who have a "local orientation" (i.e., strongly identify with their institution) are less likely to meet the subculture definitional criteria.

The fragmentation of academe by disciplinary cultures is increasing, as is the cultural distance between disciplines (Clark, 1980; Clark, 1984), with "each discipline delimiting its tenets of thought around certain facets of reality and adopting its own ways of viewing the world" (Clark, 1980, p. 18). For example, the chemist who seeks universal and quantifiable answers to chemical problems by "stripping away" (Becher, 1987, p. 280) their complexities has a very--and, perhaps, irreconcilably -- different view of the purposes and processes of inquiry than the educational psychologist who seeks to understand and cope with the complexity of human development. The disciplines themselves, however, can also be divided by sub-specialty, gender, race, and contract status. We will discuss these subgroups within subcultures in a later section.

Influence of Organizational Structure on Disciplinary Subcultures

The needs of different segments of the post-secondary market have shaped the evolution of different sectors of higher education with somewhat different, if not distinct, missions (Clark, 1963; Ruscio, 1987). Community colleges have typically included community development and adult education in their missions. Liberal arts colleges are usually committed to high quality teaching of undergraduates and

education of "the whole person". Differences in mission and commitment have, in turn, an impact on the recruitment, socialization, tasks, and performance standards of faculty members (Clark, 1963; Ruscio, 1987). For example, a faculty member in a liberal arts college is likely to have a heavy teaching load (undergraduates with a relatively shallow understanding of the subject area), have few colleagues with similar scholarly interests, and have opportunities to collaborate on research and development with colleagues from different disciplines (Ruscio, 1987). In this case, the faculty member's role in, and commitment to, the institution may interfere with her or his involvement in and commitment to the discipline (Blau, 1973; Caplow & McGee, 1968).

Institutional size and complexity also affect disciplinary subcultures (Clark, 1963, 1984). Larger and more complex IHEs are more likely to have numerous faculty subcultures than a unified faculty culture; "[t]he sub-groups are not duplicate cells, or units split on a single criterion, but are unlike cells, established by multiple criteria" (Clark, 1963, p. 139). Thus, in addition to divisions along disciplinary lines, one may find sub-cultures based on length of service (e.g., junior faculty groups), commitment to collective bargaining (e.g., union v. non-union groups), contract type (e.g., part-time faculty groups), involvement with student activities, and so on (Ruscio, 1987). These groups can only be considered to be subcultures, however, if they have persistent interaction and mechanisms for socialization and social control (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985).

Disciplinary subcultures can be found in academic departments and at the school level in programs for professional education (Clark, 1980; Millett, 1962). In the latter case, disciplinary culture tends to reflect the norms and assumptions of the major occupational areas for which the school provides preparation as well as those of the graduate education experiences of faculty members. For example, faculty members in education are likely to focus their efforts toward improving educational practice in "the real world" of schools by means of consultation as well as research (Becher, 1987).

The administrative culture of an institution also shapes faculty subcultures (Ruscio, 1987). For example, some institutions have a "management temperament", others an "academic temperament" (Ruscio, 1987, p. 355). The former type of IHE is characterized by decision-making and constraints on actions set "on high" (Ruscio, 1987, p. 355) by administrators who have a broad vision for the institution across departments and disciplines. This arrangement may be typical of those institutions in which administrators have longer service than faculty or in which faculty subcultures are weak or not committed to involvement in institutional decision-making. In institutions of an academic temperament, the tone for decisions and governance is "set from below" (Ruscio, 1987, p. 353) by faculty members within departments and disciplines. Disciplinary subcultures are likely to be particularly strong in this type of institution, although faculty may also be divided by political positions and perceived status of the discipline.

Subcultures Within Academic Subcultures

Each discipline comprises a number of separate areas of inquiry, or specialties. The specialties obtain strong loyalties from the faculty within them; "[to] affiliate with a particular specialism (sic) is to become, except in a few heavily populated areas, a member of a relatively small and close-knit community" (Becher, 1987, p. 292). In most cases, members of specialties are a reference group for ideas and professional support and have fairly regular contact with one another (Becher, 1987).

In the past two decades, other readily identifiable subgroups have emerged within the faculty which may or may not meet the definition of subculture employed here. These groups include women faculty, minority faculty, and part-time faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Consider just one: women. Sociolinguistic research (Phillips, 1980) suggests that the language of men and women is quite different. For example, the language of women is more inclusive; women are likely to use questions as part of a general strategy to continue conversations, to seek connections between themes in the discussion (Mitchell, 1987), and to elicit the ideas and feelings of others (Gilligan, 1982). Men use questions as simple requests for information and to establish a hierarchy of issues. Men and women have different communication styles and often fail to perceive the other's style because of differences in topic shifts, self-disclosure, aggressiveness, interruption, and listening (Coates, 1986). The analysis of language patterns of men and women administrators suggests a clashing of two cultures. Thus, the possibility for gender-specific subcultures has some theoretical and empirical support.

Whether any one of the groups listed above (women, minority, part-time faculty) is a subculture depends on the definition of subculture one chooses. If a subculture is a group of people with common problems (cf. Schein, 1985; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), then women, minority, and part-time faculty may be subcultures within disciplinary and academic cultures. Shared problems may also lead to interactions which, if continued, could lead to the development of subcultures (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). If, however, a subculture is a group of people who have persistent interaction, a distinct group identity, and collective unique understandings which form the basis for action, women, minority, and part-time faculty on most campuses--particularly large universities--would not qualify as subcultures.

Two More Ways of Viewing Faculty Groupings As Cultural Phenomena

Surprisingly little empirical research has been published that is focused on faculty groups using the subculture concept, particularly from the point of view of anthropology. Much of the published research violates the definitions of subculture used in this paper (Bolton & Kammeyer, 1972; Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). Perhaps examinations of faculty enclaves using the cultural perspective have been limited somewhat by the constraints imposed by existing definitions of subculture; we do not know. In any event, given the interest in viewing IHEs through the cultural perspective (Kuh & Whitt, forthcoming; Tierney, 1988), additional frameworks examining the behavior of faculty groups are needed. In this section, we briefly describe two cultural

frameworks, the clan and the occupational community, which--to our knowledge--have not been used to examine faculty behavior.

Academic Clans

A clan is a well-defined, institution-specific community that has existed for some time and employs relatively stable acculturation mechanisms (Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983). "The result is that the members of the clan come to share a rather complex understanding of their environment, which is largely taken for granted and which they label with a special language" (Wilkens & Ouchi, 1983, p. 469). Because culture is context-bound, an academic clan perspective may provide a more accurate description of faculty behavior than the discipline-based subculture concept. In this section, we rely heavily on the Wilkens and Ouchi (1983) description of clan-like behavior in organizations.

Clans are found in settings which are relatively complex and high in uncertainty. Such conditions are compatible the description of IHEs as organized anarchies (Cohen & March, 1974). Three additional conditions favorable to the development of clans are compatible with characterizations of faculty groups in the higher education literature. First, clans have a long history and stable membership. The group's history is long and rich enough to permit the emergence of "stories" to assist in cultural understanding. Relatively stable membership allows norms to develop over time which, in turn, suggest to newcomers how to behave.

Second, few interesting or appealing alternatives to membership in the clan are available within the immediate setting; thus the clan has

little competition from other groups for members' affections and attentions. Membership in an academic clan tends to isolate faculty from other groups that hold competing views. This isolation tends to encourage the development of a unique sense of identity. Some clan members may develop chauvinistic attitudes toward other groups and discredit orientations that differ from their own (e.g., humanities vs. business faculty; researchers vs. faculty heavily involved in service).

Finally, because the clan is the primary locus of interaction for members, academic clans tend to develop idiosyncratic explanations and understandings of event and actions. Such behavior perpetuates circular thinking and insulates the clan from ideas which are not part of the ideology on which the clan relies to interpret events and actions in the IHE (Weick, 1983). The understandings shared by clans are probably not as deep nor immutable as the anthropological interpretations of the subculture concept would suggest. Thus, Wilkens and Ouchi (1983) suggest that the attitudes and views of members of academic clans may be more open to change than some might believe.

Members of academic clans do not necessarily share common goals; they expect the institution to acknowledge the value of their individual contributions rather than be judged by the performance of the clan. As with discipline-based departments, clans are more concerned with the external legitimacy of the clan rather than its local image. Thus, an affiliation with a larger academic clan external to the IHE--such as one's discipline--is compatible with clan-like behavior.

Occupational Communities

Another alternative for explaining differences in the behavior of groups of faculty is the occupational community. According to Van Maanen and Barley (1984), an occupational community is:

> a group of people who consider themselves to be engaged in the same sort of work; whose identity is drawn from the work; who share with one another a set of values, norms and perspectives that apply to but extend beyond work related matters; and whose social relationships meld work and leisure" (p. 287).

Thus, the concept of occupational community reflects the "pervasiveness of occupational identification and the convergence of informal friendship patterns and colleague relationships (Gertzel, 1961, p. 38). The following is drawn from Van Maanen and Barley (1984).

The first of the four elements in the Van Maanen and Barley (1984) definition of occupational communities is the acknowledgement of a boundary or frame of reference on the scope of one's work; in IHEs, the boundaries are often defined by the subject matter of the discipline. For many faculty in research universities and prestigious liberal arts colleges, the frame of reference is defined externally (e.g., subgroups within scholarly disciplines, such as "invisible colleges") (Crane, 1972).

The second feature of an occupational community is the identity or self-image derived from the occupational role which is constructed and reconstructed through interactions with others. This image is sharpened

when members of the occupational community possess, or believe they possess, some esoteric, scarce, socially valued and unique abilities. This also encourages the perception that one's own occupational community is somehow different from the rest of the faculty subgroups. A pervasive, esoteric system of codes or language emerges which also engenders a strong identity with the occupational community. The confluence of codes and community-specific language determine a group perspective on reality and influence how a member of the community interprets what takes place in an institution of higher education.

> A common language, which arises from a similarity of tradition...facilitates mutual understanding...but, taken by itself, it is not sufficient to constitute a communal relationship...it is only with the emergence of a consciousness of difference from third persons who speak a different language that the fact that two persons speak the same language and, in that respect, share a common situation, can lead them to a feeling of community (Weber, 1968, p. 42-43).

The identification with the community is also fostered by a high degree of involvement in the work itself.

Third, because members of an occupational community perceive other members to be their primary reference group, they come to share a distinct pattern of values, beliefs, norms, and interpretations for judging the appropriateness of one another's actions. Newcomers to occupational communities typically encounter rigorous socialization

processes through which members learn and must adopt the standards of the occupational group. Thus, members of an occupational community develop a collective perspective on routine matters and evaluate themselves and others within this context. If outsiders do not value the faculty community, members tend to turn to one another for support and, thus, sustain a view of outsiders that justifies and vindicates itself as a defense against threats and challenges to the integrity of the community. If the occupational community penetrates multiple aspects of an individual faculty member's life, the subgroup is more likely to become viewed as that individual's primary reference group.

Finally, the distinction between work and leisure activities for members of an occupational community often becomes blurred. "Those who live within an occupational embrace find their work and leisure pursuits mixed in many ways and mixed so that where one ends and the other begins is a matter of some ambiguity (Kanter, 1977)" (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984, p. 307). A network of social relations develops when members of a faculty group seek, for whatever reasons, relationships with one another away from the campus. A circumscribed social network is more likely to evolve when faculty live and work in close physical proximity. Of course, physical proximity is not a necessary or sufficient condition for melding social and work relationships (Schein, 1985); however, proximity promotes and eases social interaction (Newcomb, 1962).

The blending of work and social interaction is also encouraged when the occupational community restricts members' social relations. Faculty who spend long hours in the library or laboratory develop a "normal" work

week rhythm which may differ from other faculty groups on a campus. For many, the overlap between work and social relationships is a mild, sometimes unnoticed, intrusion into a person's life. For some, such as residence hall staff who hold full-time, live-in positions and thus establish social relations mainly with fellow counselors (Barley, 1979), the occupation becomes a "total work institution" (Goffman, 1961).

As with disciplinary subcultures, members of an occupational community believe that only its members have the proper knowledge, skills, and orientations necessary to make decisions about how their work is to be performed and evaluated. Some disciplines have been more successful than others in creating, maintaining, and protecting a distinctive and relative autonomous culture (e.g., the biological and physical sciences). One way of estimating the potency of an occupational community is the degree to which the community is self-regulating; that is, "the community's ability to dictate who will and who will not be a member, as well as how the content and conduct of a member's work will be assessed" (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984, p. 309).

Of course, peer evaluation of one's contributions is a major determinant of the direction (and duration) of an academic career. For example, the status of most faculty at research universities is enhanced by acquiring national reputation in the discipline. Such recognition comes from other community members judging on the basis of scholarly contributions or new discoveries, the accumulation of experience over a long period of time, or the development of a particular style in one's work or pursuing new paths of inquiry (Crane, 1972). Performance of

faculty members is assessed according to depth and range of knowledge, the application of one's area of expertise to persistent and emerging problems of significance, and the degree to which one develops new ideas or innovative approaches.

Prestige for faculty members is also associated with working in particular settings; e.g., many faculty deem appointments in departments at major research universities as being of higher status than those at teacher's colleges or at many liberal arts colleges. Finally, one's worth or importance to the occupational community may be enhanced by expanding one's network of acquaintances (e.g., the people you know and with whom you work can advance your career). Doctoral students fortunate enough to have prolific sponsors have an advantage in launching a career in the academy (Hunter & Kuh, 1987).

The knowledge necessary to understand interactions within an occupational community can never be fully grasped:

> "because it is inextricably tied to the context which gives rise to its use and, in part, because even the most astute cultural members know that such knowledge is continually in flux and thus more than an occasional problem for cultural members themselves... Culture is not something a group possesses more or less of at any given time; it is something it is (Van Maanen & Barley, 1984, p. 307).

Implications

Too often, descriptions of faculty culture reflect a naive, simplistic understanding of the diversity of attitudes, values,

structures, rules, and cultural artifacts (language, symbols, stories) common to faculty groups. Clan and occupational community frameworks suggest that the differences among faculty groups may be as interesting as the similarities. Occupational communities legitimate the mediating influences of power and conflict and deemphasize the often exaggerated role of formal leadership in influencing faculty behavior.

Academic clans and occupational communities can be used as guiding frameworks for research on the careers of faculty and administrators as well as offering a different perspective on the role of peer groups in IHEs. How faculty learn skills and the specific work routines and practices necessary to be successful in a specific institutional setting can also be illuminated through clan and occupational community perspectives. In addition, viewing faculty groups as clans or occupational communities reinforces the importance of discovering how faculty actually perform their jobs rather than emphasizing what others think they should be doing. Perrow (1981), for example, suggested that faculty may not spend much time thinking or planning their teaching or research programs because they are rushing about answering phones, attending meetings, engaging in brief encounters with colleagues, students and administrators, and responding to problems in the environment. As is the case with organizations, perhaps faculty groups are influenced as much by serendipity as design (Weick, 1982).

Conclusion

We return to same question with which we began: is the academic profession one subculture or many subcultures? The answer, it seems is yes or, rather, both. Segmentation and fragmentation are characteristic of the academic profession, but there is also the integrating effect of over-arching basic values (Ruscio, 1987).

> Paradoxically, the more it becomes possible to portray the components of the academic world as fragmented and particularized, and the more readily it can be shown that these components are in a constant state of change, the more one is inclined to apprehend that world in its entirety...by understanding the parts and acknowledging their particularity, one can better understand the whole... e pluribus unum (Becher, 1987, p. 298).

While we agree with Becher's analysis, the literature is silent on much of what constitutes the cultural material of faculty life. Few ethnographies are available which describe in vivid, thick detail the language that faculty in one or more disciplines use to communicate with one another. The academy is rich in symbols, stories, and nuances of language that differentiate colleges and universities from one another and from other societal institutions. Yet these codes are essentially unexamined in the literature.

It has been argued conceptually and theoretically that the meaning and importance of events and actions in IHEs are communicated through

ideologies and metaphors common to various disciplinary subgroups. While much is made of the importance of appropriate socialization processes to the success of young scholars, the role of institutional and disciplinary culture in that socialization is essentially undocumented. We conclude that anthropological investigations into the fabric of faculty life are underrepresented in the study of higher education and would make important contributions to understanding faculty performance.

Note:
[1]In a case study review of the literature on decision-making, Clark, Astuto and Kuh (1986) attempted to find examples of Weick's (1976) concept of loose coupling. Few examples could be found. One might conclude that universities are not loosely coupled as Weick asserted. What is more likely the case, however, is that researchers who produce case studies do not look for evidence of loose coupling and, therefore, do not describe such events (or lack of events!). The same may be true of our literature review in search of artifacts of faculty culture. While many writers assert that language, stories, customs and so on distinguish faculty groups, few scholars have taken the time to document these assertions.

Bibliography

Allaire, Y. and Firsirotu, M. E. 1984. "Theories of Organizational Culture." Organization Studies, 5, 193-226.

Ansa, P. 1986. "Organizational Culture and Work Group Behavior: An Empirical Study. Journal of Management Studies, 23(3), 347-362.

Astin, A. W. 1985. Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin A. W. and Holland, J. L. 1961. "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 308-316.

Austin, A. E. and Gamson, Z. F. 1983. Academic workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Baker, F. S. 1978. Glimpses of Hanover's Past. Seymour, IN: Graessle-Mercer.

Baker, E. L. 1980. "Managing Organizational Culture." The McKinsey Quarterly, 51-67.

Barker, R. G. and Gump, P. V. eds. 1964. Big School, Small School. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Barker, R. G. 1968. Ecological Psychology: Concepts and Methods for Studying The Environment of Human Behavior. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Baird, L. L. 1987. "The College Environment Revisited: A Review of Research and Theory." Paper read at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, November Baltimore.

Barley, S. 1983. "Semiotics and the Study of Occupational and Organizational Cultures." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 393-413.

Bate, P. 1984. "The Impact of Organizational Culture on Approaches to Organizational Problem-solving." Organization Studies, 5, 43-66.

Bates, R. J. 1987. "Corporate Culture, Schooling, and Educational Administration." Educational Adminstration Quarterly, 23, 79-115.

Becher, T. 1981. "Toward A Definition of Disciplinary Cultures." Studies in Higher Education, 6, 109-122.

Becher, T. 1984. "The Cultural View." In B.R. Clark (Ed.), Perspectives On Higher Education, pp. 165-198. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Becher, T. 1987. "The Disciplinary Shaping of the Profession. In The Academic Profession, edited by B. Clark (pp. 271-303). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Becker, H. S. and Geer, B. 1960. "Latent Culture." Administrative Science Quarterly, 5, 303-313.

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C. and Strauss, A. L. 1961. Boys In White. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, H.S., Geer, B. and Hughes, E.C. 1968. Making The Grade: The Academic Side of College Life. New York: Wiley.

Benson, J. K. 1983. "Paradigm and Praxis in Organizational Analysis." Research in Organizational Behavior, 5, 33-56.

Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. 1966. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Bertalanffy, L. von. 1968. General System Theory (rev. ed.). New York: Braziller.

Bess, J. L. 1978. "Anticipatory Socialization of Graduate Students." Research in Higher Education, 8, 289-317.

Bess, J. L. 1982. University Organization: A Matrix Analysis of the Academic Professions. New York: Human Services Press.

Biglan, A. 1973. "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas." Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 195-203.

Blau, P. M. 1973. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: Wiley.

Bolton, C. D. and Kammeyer, K.C.W. 1967. The University Sudent: A Study of Student Behavior and Values. New Haven, CT: College and University Press.

Bolton, C. D. and Kammeyer, K. C. W. 1972. "Campus Cultures, Role Orientations, and Social Types." In College and Student: Selected Readings in the Social Psychology of Higher Education, edited by

K. Feldman, pp. 377-392. New York: Pergamon.

Bowen, H. R. 1977. Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H. R. and Schuster, J. H. 1986. American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, W. R. 1982. Academic Politics. University, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Bragg, A. K. 1976. The Socialization Process in Higher Education. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. 1976. Higher Education in Transition, third ed. New York: Harper and Row.

Bushnell, J. H. 1962. "Student Culture at Vassar." In The American College, edited by N. Sanford, pp. 489-514. New York: Wiley.

Cameron, K. S. 1984. "Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, 55, 122-144.

Cameron, K. S. 1985. "Managing Self-renewal. In Leadership and Institutional Renewal, edited by R.M. Davis (pp. 39-48). New Directions in Higher Education No. 49. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Cameron, K. S. 1985. Cultural Congruence, Strength, and Type. Working Paper, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Cameron, K. S. and Whetten, D. 1983. "Models of the Organizational Lifecycle: Applications To Higher Education." Review of Higher Education, 6, 269-299.

Caplow, T. and McGee, R. J. 1958. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books.

Caplow, T. and McGee, R. 1968. "Publish or Perish." In Organizational Careers: A Sourcebook for Theory, edited in B. G. Glaser (pp. 227-229). Chicago: Aldine.

Chaffee, E. E. 1984. "Successful Strategic Management In Small Private Colleges. Journal of Higher Education, 55(2), 212-241.

Clark, B. R. 1960. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Clark, B. R. 1963. "Faculty Culture." In The Study of Campus Cultures, edited by T. Lunsford. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

Clark, B. R. 1970. The Distinctive College: Reed, Antioch and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine.

Clark, B. R. 1972. "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17(2), 178-184.

Clark, B. R. 1980. Academic Culture. Yale Higher Education Research Group /Report No. 42. New Haven, CT: Institute for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.

Clark, B. R. 1984. The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-national Perspective. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R., Heist, P., McConnell, T. R., Trow, M. A., & Yonge, G. 1972. Students and Colleges: Interaction and Change. Berkeley, CA: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Clark, B. R. and Trow, M. 1966. "The Organizational Context." In College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research, edited by T. M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson. Chicago: Aldine.

Clark, D. L., Astuto, T. A. and Kuh, G. D. 1986. "Strength of Coupling in the Organization and Operation of Colleges and Universities." In Research and Thought in Educational Administration, edited by G. Johnston. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Clark, S. M. and Corcoran, M. 1986. "Perspectives on the Professional Socialization of Women Faculty." Journal of Higher Education, 57, 20-43.

Clark, T. D. 1977. Indiana University: Midwestern Pioneer. Vol. III, Years of Fulfillment. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Coates, J. 1986. Women, Men, and Language: A Socioliguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language. New York: Longman.

Cohen, A. K. 1970. "A General Theory of Subcultures." In The Sociology of Subcultures, edited by D. Arnold (pp. 96-108). Berkeley, CA: Glendessary Press.

Corbett, H. D., Firestone, W. A. and Rossman, G. B. 1987. "Resistance to Planned Change and the Sacred in School Cultures." Educational Adminstration Quarterly, 23, 36-59.

Corcoran, M. and Clark, S. M. 1984. "Professional Socialization and Contemporary Career Attitudes of Three Faculty Generations." Research in Higher Education, 20, 131-153.

Coughlin, E. K. July 17, 1985. "The `Crits' v. The Legal Academy: Arguing A Case Against The Law." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 5-6.

Crane, D. 1972. Diffusion Of Knowledge In Scientific Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Creswell, J. W. and Bean, J. P. 1981. "Research Output, Socialization, and the Biglan Model." Research in Higher Education, 15. 69-91.

Cusick, P. A. 1987. "Introduction." Educational Adminstration Quarterly, 23, 5-10.

Deal, T. E. and Kennedy, A. A. 1982. Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Deal, T. E. and Kennedy, A. A. 1983. "Culture: A new look through old lenses." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19, 497-505.

Dill, D. D. 1982. "The Management of Academic Culture: Notes On The Management of Meaning and Social Integration." Higher Education, 11, 303-320.

Durkheim, E. 1933. The Division of Labor in Society. (G. Simpson, Trans.). New York: Free. (Original work published 1893)

Ebers, M. 1985. "Understanding Organizations: The Poetic Mode." Journal of Management, 11(2), 51-62.

Fass, P. S. 1977. The Damned and The Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920's. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feldman, S. 1985. "Culture and Conformity: An Essay On Individualized Adaptation In A Centralized Bureaucracy. Human Relations, 38(4), 341-356.

Feldman, K. A. and Newcomb, T. M. 1969. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freedman, M. B. 1967. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freedman, M. 1979. Academic Culture and Faculty Development. Berkeley, CA.: Montaigne, Inc.

Erickson, F. 1987. "Conceptions of School Culture: An Overview." Educational Administration Quarterly, 23, 11-24.

Etzioni, A. 1975. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement, and Their Correlates, rev.ed. New York: Free Press.

Frost, P. and Morgan, G. 1983. "Symbols and Sensemaking: The Realization of a Framework." In Organizational Symbolism, edited by L. Pondy, P. Frost, G, Morgan and T. Dandridge, pp. 207-236. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Gaff, J.G. and Wilson, R.C. 1971. "Faculty Cultures and Interdisciplinary Studies. Journal of Higher Education, 42(3), 186-201.

Galligani, D. J. 1984. Changing The Culture of The University. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Geertz, C. 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Georgiou, P. 1973. "The Goal Paradigm and Notes Toward a Counter Paradigm." Adminstrative Science Quarterly, 18, 291-310.

Gilligan, C. 1982. In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gottleib, D. and Hodgkins, B. 1963. "College Student Subcultures: Their Structures and Characteristics Relative To Student Attitude Change." School Review, 71, 266-289.

Grant, G. and Riesman, D. 1978. The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Green, E. A. 1979. Mary Lyon and Mount Holyoke: Opening The Gates. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Gregory, K. 1983. "Native-view Paradigms: MUltiple Culture and Culture Conflicts in Organizations." Adminstrative Science Quarterly, 28, 359-376.

Gusfield, J. and Riesman, D. 1968. "Faculty Culture and Academic Careers." In The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis, edited by K. Yamamoto (pp. 271-291). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Hall, H.T. (1969). The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Hall, H. T. 1976. Beyond Culture. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Heath, D. H. 1968. Growing Up In College: Liberal Education and Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heath, D. H. 1981. "A College's Ethos: A Neglected Key to Effectiveness and Survival." Liberal Education, 67, 89-111.

Hoebel, E. A. 1966. Anthropology: The Study of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. L. 1981. "Culture and Organizations." International Studies of Management and Organization, 10, 15-41.

Horowitz, H. L. 1984. Alma Mater: Design and Experience in Ten Women's Colleges From Their Nineteenth-century Beginnings to The 1930's. Boston: Beacon.

Horowitz, H. L. 1986. "The 1960s and the Transformation of Campus Cultures." History of Education Quarterly, 26, 1-38.

Horowitz, H. L. 1987. Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures From The End of The 18th Century To The Present. New York: Knopf.

Hunter, D. E. and Kuh, G. D. 1987. "The "Write Wins": Characteristics of Prolific Contributors to the Higher Education Literature." Journal of Higher Education, 58, 443-462.

Irwin, J. 1970. "Notes On The Present Status of the Concept of Subculture." In (Ed.), The Sociology of Subculture, edited by D. Arnold (pp. 164-170). Berkeley, CA: Glendessary Press.

Jelinek, M., Smircich, L. and Hirsch, P. 1983. "Introduction: A `Code' of Many Colors." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 331-338.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. 1969. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.

Jensen, K. 1982. "Women's Work and Academic Culture." Higher Education, 11, 67-83.

Kadushin, C. 1976. "Networks and Circles in the Production of Culture." American Behavioral Scientist, 19(6), 769-784.

Kamens, D. H. 1977. "Legitimating Myths and Educational Organizations: The Relationship Between Organizational Ideology and Formal Structure. American Sociological Review, 42, 208-219.

Katchadourian, H. A. and Boli, J. 1985. Careerism and Intellectualism Among College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, J. and Hartnett, R. T. 1976. Scholars In The Making: The Development of Graduate and Professional Students. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Keeton, M. T. 1971. Models and Mavericks. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelly, J.W. (February, 1985). Storytelling In High Tech Organizations: A Medium For Sharing Culture. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Fresno, California.

Kilmann, R. H., Saxton, R., Serpa, R. and Associates. eds. 1985. Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. A. 1981. "Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences." In The Modern American College, edited by A. Chickering, pp. 232-255. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kroeber, A. L. and Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kuh, G. D. 1981. Indices Of Quality In The Undergraduate Experience. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Kuh, G. D., Shedd, J. D., and Whitt, E. J. 1987. "Student Affairs and Liberal Education: Unrecognized Common Law Partners." Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 252-260.

Kuh, G. D., Whitt, E. J., and Shedd, J. D. 1987. Student Affairs, 2001: A Paradigmatic Odyssey. Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Kuh, G. D. and Whitt, E. J. forthcoming. The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Higher Education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lane, J. 1985. "Academic Profession in Academic Organizations." Higher Education, 14, 241-268.

Langland, E. and Gove, W. 1981. A Feminist Perspective in the Academy: The Difference It Makes. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Leemon, T. A. 1972. The Rites of Passage In A Student Culture. New York: Teachers College Press.

Light, D. 1974. "The Structure of Academic Professions." Sociology of Education, 47, 2-28.

Levi-Strauss, C. 1973. Anthropologie Structurale Deux. Paris: Librairie Plon.

Levine, D. O. 1986. The American College and The Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lewin, K. 1936. Principles of Topological Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K. 1951. Field Theory In Social Science. New York: Harper and Row.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. 1985. Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lodahl, J. B. and Gordon, G. 1972. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and The Functioning of University Graduate Departments." American Sociological Review, 37, 57-72.

Louis, M. R. 1983. "Organizations as Culture-bearing Milieux." In Organizational Symbolism, edited by L. Pondy, P. Frost, G. Morgan and T. Dandridge (pp. 39-54). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Louis, M. R. 1985. "An Investigator's Guide to Workplace Culture." In Organizational Culture. edited by P. Frost and Associates (pp. 73-93). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Malinowski, B. 1961. Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. 1982. "Stories and Scripts in Organizational Settings." In Cognitive Social Psychology, edited by A. Hastorf and A. Isen, pp. 225-305. New York: Elsevier North Holland.

Martin, J. and Siehl, C. 1983. "Organizational Culture and Counterculture: An Uneasy Symbiosis." Organizational Dynamics, 12(2), 52-64.

Masland, A. T. (May, 1982). "Simulators, Myth, and Ritual in Higher Education." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Denver, Colorado.

Masland, A. T. 1985. "Organizational Culture in The Study of Higher Education." The Review of Higher Education, 8(2), 157-168.

Mead, M. 1978. Culture and Commitment. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Meister, J. S. 1982. "A Sociologist Looks at Two Schools: The Amherst and Hampshire Experiences. Change, 14(2), 26-34.

Merton, R. K. 1968. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Metzger, W. P. 1987. "The Academic Profession in the United States. In The Academic Profession, edited by B. Clark (pp. 123-208). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. 1985. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure As Myth and Ceremony." American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. 1984. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Millett, J. D. 1962. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mitchell, D. E. 1984. "Culture and Community: The Authority of Myth and Metaphor." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Mitchell, B. A. 1987. "Modes For Managing The Assistant Principalship: Sex Differences in Socialization, Role Orientation and Mobility of Public Secondary School Assistant Principals." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Mitroff, I. 1983. "Archetypal Social Systems Analysis: On The Deeper Structure of Human Systems. Academy of Management Review, 8, 387-397.

Mitroff, I. I. 1983. Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind: Toward A New View of Organizational Policy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mitroff, J. and Kilmann, R. 1978. Methodological Approaches To Social Sciences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, G. 1980. "Paradigms, Metaphors, and Puzzle-solving In Organizational Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 25(4), 605-622.

Morgan, G. 1986. Images of Organizations. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morgan, G. Frost, P. and Pondy, L. 1983. "Organizational Symbolism." In Organizational Symbolism, edited by L. Pondy, G. Morgan and T. Dandridge. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Morrill, P. H. and Spees, E. R. 1982. The Academic Profession: Teaching In Higher Education. New York: Human Sciences Press.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. 1987. A Perspective on Student Affairs. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.

Nelson, D. T. 1961, Luther College: 1861-1961. Decorah, IA: Luther College Press.

Newcomb, T. M. 1962. "Student Peer-group Influence." In The American College, edited by N. Sanford, pp. 469-488. New York: Wiley.

Newcomb, T, M., Koenig, K. E., Falacks, R. and Warwick, D. P. 1967. Persistence and Change: Bennington College and Its Students After 25 Years. New York: Wiley.

Ouchi, W. and Wilkins, A. 1985. "Organizational Cultures. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 457-483.

Pace, C. R. 1972. Education and Evangelism: A Profile of Protestant Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pace, C. R. 1974. Demise of Diversity: A Comparative Profile of Eight Types of Institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pace C. R. and Stern, G. G. 1958. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, 269-277.

Parlett, M. R. 1977. "The Department as a Learning Milieu." Studies in Higher Education, 2, 173-181.

Parsons, T. and Platt, G. 1973. The American University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Patton, M. Q. 1980. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pervin, L. A. 1968. "The College As A Social System: Student Perception of Students, Faculty, and Administration." Journal of Educational Research, 61, 281-284.

Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K. S., Mets, L. A., Jones, P. and Ettington, D. 1986. The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning: A Review of The Research Literature. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Pettigrew, A. (1979). "On Studying Organizational Cultures." Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.

Pffefer, J. and Salancik, G. P. 1974. "Organizational Decisionmaking As A Political Process: The Case of The University Budget." Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 135-151.

Philips, S. U. 1980. "Sex differences and Language." Annual Review of Anthropology, 9, 523-544.

Pondy, L. R. 1978. "Leadership As A Language Game. In Leadership: Where Else Can We Go?, edited by M. W. McCall, Jr. and M. M. Lombardo. Durham: Duke University Press.

Porto, B. L. 1984. "The Small College Experience: Not For Students Only." Liberal Education, 70, 229-230.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. 1952. Structure and Function in Primitive Society. London: Oxford University Press.

Riesman, D. 1981. On Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riesman, D. and Jencks, C. 1962. "The Viability of the American College." In The American College, edited by N. Sanford, pp. 74-192. New York: Wiley.

Ross, I. and Higgins, E. 1980. "The Development of Theories of Culture." In People in Culture, edited by I. Rossi (pp. 31-78). New York: Praeger.

Ruscio, K. P. 1987. "Many Sectors, Many Professions." In The Academic Profession, edited by B. Clark (pp. 331-368). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Salmans, S. January 7, 1983. "New Vogue: Company Culture." New York Times, p. 1.

Sanford, R. N. 1962. "The Developmental Status of the Freshman." In The American College, edited by N. Sanford, pp. 253-282. New York: Wiley.

Sanford, N. 1967. Where Colleges Fail: A Study of the Student As A Person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarton, M. 1961. The Small Room. New York: W.W. Norton.

Schein, E. H. 1985. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, P. and Ogilvy, J. 1979. The Emergent Paradigm: Changing Patterns of Thought and Belief. Menlo Park, CA: SRI Analytical Report No. 7, Values and Lifestyles Program.

Scott, W. 1965. Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Sergiovanni, T. J. 1984. "Leadership As Cultural Expression." In Leadership and Organizational Culture: New Perspectives On Administrative Theory and Practice, edited by T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally, pp. 105-114. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Smircich, L. 1983. "Concepts of Culture and organizational Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 339-358.

Snow, C. P. 1959. The Two Cultures and The Scientific Revolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, C. P. 1964. The Two Cultures: A Second Look. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, B. R. 1971. The Hidden Curriculum. New York: Knopf.

Stern, G. G. 1970. People In Context. New York: Wiley.

Tierney, W. G. 1988. "Organizational Culture in Higher Education: Defining the Essentials." Journal of Higher Education, 59, 2-21.

Toennies, F. 1957. Community and Society (P. Loomis, Trans.). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Trice, H.M., Belasco, J. & and Alutto, J. 1969. "The Role of Ceremonials In Organizational Behavior." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 23, 40-51.

Trice, H. M. and Beyer, J. 1984. "Studying Organizational Cultures Through Rites and Ceremonials." Academy of Management Review, 9, 653-669.

Trippet, B. K. 1982. Wabash On My Mind. Crawfordsville, IN: Wabash College.

Tuma, N. and Grimes, A. 1981. "A Comparison of Models of Role Orientations of Professionals in a Research-oriented University." Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 187-206.

van Gennep, A. 1960. The Rites of Passage. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Valentine, K. et al (February, 1985). "Understanding An Oganization Through Oral Traditions: No Kinks, Snakes or Whiners Need Apply." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association.

Van Maanen, J. 1976. "Breaking In: Socialization To Work." In Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society, edited by R. Dubin, pp. 67-130. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Van Maanen, J. 1979. "The Fact of Fiction in Organizational Ethnography." Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 539-550.

Van Maanen, J. 1984. "Doing Old Things In New Ways: The Chains of Socialization." In College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences, edited by J. Bess, pp. 211-247. New York: New York University Press.

Van Maanen, J. 1987. "Managing Education Better: Some Thoughts On The Management of Student Cultures in American Colleges and Universities." Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Insitutional Research, May at Kansas City.

Van Maanen, J. and Barley, S. R. 1984. "Occupational Communities: Culture and Control in Organizations." Research in Organizational Behavior, 6, 287-365.

Van Maanen, J. and Barley, S. R. 1985. "Cultural Organization: Fragments Of A Theory." In Organizational Culture, edited by P.J. Frost et al. (pp. 31-53). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Van Maanen, J. and Schein, E. H. 1979. "Toward A Theory Of Organizational Socialization." In (Ed.), Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 1, edited by B.M. Staw (pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wallace, A. F. C. 1970. Culture and Personality. New York: Random House.

Walsh, W. B. 1973. Theories Of Person-environment Interaction: Implications For The College Student. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.

Warren, J. R. 1968. "Student Perceptions of College Subcultures." American Educational Research Journal, 5, 213-232.

Weber, M. 1947. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press.

Wells, H. B 1980. Being Lucky: Reminiscences and Reflections. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Weick, K. E. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-18.

Weick, K. E. 1979. The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. E. 1983. "Contradictions in a Community of Scholars: The Cohesion-Accuracy Tradeoff." Review of Higher Education, 20, 23-33.

Wilkins, A. and Ouchi, W. 1983. "Efficient Cultures: Exploring the Relationship Between Culture and Performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 468-481.

Yamamoto, K. (Ed). 1968. The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Yinger, J. M. 1970. "Contraculture and Subculture." In Sociology of Subcultures, edited by D. Arnold (pp. 121-134). Berkeley, CA: Glendessary Press.

Zwerling, L. S. 1988. "The Miami-Dade Story." Change, 20(1), 10-23.